

To the Honorable Judge,  
Robert F Rossiter, Jr

The school district's arguments expose gross hypocrisy and bad faith. On one hand, they categorically deny any unconstitutional policy, custom or practice. Yet in the same breath, they argue it's perfectly routine to sic the cops on people for speaking out at board meetings.

They can't have it both ways. Either coordinated police retaliation is standard practice or it isn't. By admitting these police calls are normal, they've proven the existence of an egregious, recurring custom.

The district wants all the benefits of claiming no official policy while still justifying this crackdown as business as usual. That's utter nonsense. If it happens regularly, there's clearly an entrenched, unconstitutional pattern and practice. The district's spurious logic would be laughable if the implications for free speech weren't so serious.

Moreover, the unethical lengths the district's high-priced lawyers are going to obstruct the truth are appalling. Resorting to slippery legalese, denial of obvious facts, and procedural technicalities exposes the weakness of their claims. No genuine pursuit of justice relies on squashing dissent through procedural tricks.

The district has repeatedly demonstrated contempt for basic fairness and due process. Their scorched-earth tactics against a lone critic reek of intimidation. Sadly, this bullying and stonewalling seems fully condoned, if not directed, by district leadership.

I refuse to be bullied into silence. The truth will prevail, no matter how vigorously the district tries to cloak their misdeeds in legal chicanery. This motion lays bare their dishonesty and hypocrisy for all to see. I remain confident justice will be served in due course.

Furthermore, the district's blanket denials fly in the face of clear evidence that should be deemed admitted under Rule 36. Records prove they collaborated with police to retaliate against my protected speech. Their agent's involvement in initiating police action is undisputed. And the Board President's legal indemnification acknowledges the district's role in targeting me.

Despite incontrovertible proof, the district obstinately rejects any wrongdoing. This leaves no doubt that all actions against me, even clear constitutional violations, are considered fully acceptable. Such an arrogant, unapologetic posture in the face of facts makes a mockery of any notions of integrity, accountability or justice.

Therefore, I respectfully ask this Court to exercise its authority under Rule 36 to deem the undisputed fact that the phone call with Ott admitted, as the documentary evidence leaves no room for plausible denial.

Justin Riddle

402-813-2156

[Justinriddle1@gmail.com](mailto:Justinriddle1@gmail.com)